

REMARKS

This is in response to the currently outstanding non-final Official Action in the above-identified continued prosecution application.

Claims 1 to 16 were originally presented. The present Amendment amends Claims 1 to 16. No Claims 30 are canceled, and no claims are added. No new matter is added by virtue of the foregoing Amendment. Accordingly, upon the entry of the foregoing Amendment, the claims under active prosecution in this application will be Claims 1 to 16 as hereinabove amended.

The claims as they will stand upon the entry of the foregoing Amendment are set forth in full herein as required by the Rules.

More particularly, in the currently outstanding Official Action, the Examiner has:

1. Acknowledged Applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 USC 119(a)-(d) or (f), and also confirmed the receipt of the required certified copy of the priority documentation by the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

2. Acknowledged Applicants' Information Disclosure Statements as submitted on 18 June 2001, 27 August 2001 and 10 February 2003 by providing Applicants with a copy of the Forms PTO-1449 that accompanied those filings duly signed, dated and initialed by the Examiner in confirmation of consideration of the art listed therein, but **failed** to so acknowledge Applicant's Information Disclosure Statement as submitted on 15 May 2001 – **Appropriate acknowledgement of Applicants' Information Disclosure Statement of 15 May 2001 in response to this communication is respectfully requested;**
3. Failed to indicated whether or not the drawings originally filed with this application on 29 December 2000 have been accepted – **An indication concerning the acceptability of the drawings currently on file in this application in response to this communication is respectfully requested;**
4. Objected to Claims 10 and 14-16 under 37 CFR 1.75c as being in improper multiple dependent form and refused to treat those claims on their merits in view of that objection – **By the foregoing Amendment, Applicant has corrected the improper multiple dependencies in the claims as originally filed and respectfully submits that all of the claims that will remain in this application upon the entry of the foregoing Amendment are in appropriate form – a decision so holding and considering all of the foregoing claims on their merits in response to this communication is respectfully requested;**
5. Rejected Claims 1 and 11-13 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by the Matsuda reference (U.S. Patent No. 5,808,756); and

6. Objected to Claim 2 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated that if Claim 2 were to be rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of its base claim and any intervening claims, it and the claims dependent therefrom would be allowable.

No further specific comment regarding items 1-4 above is deemed to be required in these Remarks.

With respect to items 5 and 6, Applicant by the foregoing Amendment has amended all of the presently pending claims 1-16 in a manner that removes all improper multiple dependencies therefrom.

Further, by the foregoing Amendment, Applicant has amended Claims 1 and 2 such that all of the limitations of Claim 2 concerning distortion correction with the exception of those concerning luminance have been transferred from dependent Claim 2 to its base claim, independent Claim 1. Dependent Claim 2 retains a limitation concerning luminance correction. In addition, Claims 3-10 and 12-16 now depend upon Claim 1, while Claim 11 depends from Claim 7. In addition, numerous minor clarifying amendments have been made to Claims 12-16.

As noted above, the Examiner has indicated that a combination of the limitations of claims 1 and 2 is deemed to be patentable, and claims depending from such an allowable claim also are deemed to be patentable. In view of the Examiner's comments concerning Claim 11 (i.e., that the cited Matsuda reference discloses the claimed luminance correction parameter), it is Applicant's understanding that the Examiner's indication concerning the allowability of a claim combining Claims 1 and 2 as originally filed is not dependent upon the inclusion of the luminance limitations of original Claim 2 in such a combined Claim.

Accordingly, the foregoing amendment (i) corrects the formal defect of certain improper multiple dependencies in the claims of this application; (ii) combines limitations of originally filed Claims 1 and 2 in a manner that is believed to be patentable in view of the Examiner's comments concerning Claim 11, and (iii) results in all of Claims 2-16 being directly or indirectly dependent upon allowable amended Claim 1.

Consequently, in view of the foregoing Amendment and Remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims that will be present in this application upon the entry of the foregoing Amendment are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of this application in response to this communication, therefore, is respectfully requested.

Applicants also believe that additional fees beyond those submitted herewith are not required in connection with the consideration of this response to the currently outstanding Official Action. However, if for any reason a fee is required, a fee paid is inadequate or credit is owed for any excess fee paid, you are hereby authorized and requested to charge and/or credit Deposit Account No. **04-1105**, as necessary, for the correct payment of all fees which may be due in connection with the filing and consideration of this communication.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 15, 2004

Reg. No. 27,840

Tel. No. (617) 517-5508

Customer No. 21874
458454


SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

David A. Tucker
(type or print name of practitioner)
Attorney for Applicant

Edwards & Angell, LLP
P. O. Box 55874
P.O. Address

Boston, MA 02205